REMARKS

Summary

Claims 1-5, 7 and 9-17 stand in this application. Claims 6, 8 and 18 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 1, 7, 11 and 15 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

Although Applicant disagrees with the broad grounds of rejection set forth in the Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 11 and 15 in order to facilitate prosecution on the merits. Support for the above amendments can be found at least at FIG. 1 and the corresponding text of the specification.

Examiner Interview

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Baig for conducting a telephone interview with Applicants' representative on June 25, 2009. During the interview, Examiner Baig and Applicants' representative discussed the independent claims, the applied reference, and the grounds of rejection. The substance of the interview is reflected by the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5, 7 and 9-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent Publication No. 2003/0185310 to Ketchum et al. (hereinafter "Ketchum"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, the cited reference must teach every element of the claim. *See* MPEP § 2131, for example. Applicant submits that Ketchum fails to teach each and every element recited in claims 1-5, 7 and 9-17 and thus they define over Ketchum. For example, with respect to claim 1, Ketchum fails to teach, among other things, the following language:

> equalizing said filtered data streams using a plurality of
> equalizers having substantially similar equalization

Appl. No. 10/597,739
Response Dated July 29, 2009
Reply to Office Action of April 29, 2009

Docket No.: P17140/1020.P17140
Examiner: Adnan Baig
TC/A.U. 2416

parameters, wherein the number of equalizers corresponds
to the number of filtered data streams.

According to the Office Action, this language is disclosed by Ketchum at paragraphs
[0007] and [0136]. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 defines over Ketchum. Ketchum,
arguably, teaches precoding for a multipath channel in a MIMO system. More
particularly, Ketchum at the given cites teaches a decision feedback equalizer that is
adapted based on selected criterion (e.g. the minimum mean square error). Applicant
submits that this is different than the above recited language of amended independent
claim 1. Applicant submits that Ketchum fails to teach at least equalizing said filtered
data streams using a plurality of equalizers having substantially similar equalization
parameters, wherein the number of equalizers corresponds to the number of filtered data
streams as recited in amended independent claim 1.

Applicant respectfully submits that they have been unable to locate at least the
above recited language of amended independent claim 1 in the teaching of Ketchum.
Consequently, Ketchum fails to disclose all the elements or features of the claimed
subject matter. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the anticipation
rejection with respect to claim 1. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully requests
withdrawal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 2-5, which depend from
claim 1 and, therefore, contain additional features that further distinguish these claims
from Ketchum.

Claims 7, 11 and 15 have been amended to recite features similar to those recited
in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 7, 11 and 15 are not
anticipated and are patentable over Ketchum for reasons analogous to those presented
with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the
anticipation rejection with respect to claims 7, 11 and 15. Furthermore, Applicant
respectfully requests withdrawal of the anticipation rejection with respect to claims 9-10,
12-14 and 16-17 that depend from claims 7, 11 and 15 respectively, and therefore contain
additional features that further distinguish these claims from Ketchum.

Appl. No. 10/597,739
Response Dated July 29, 2009
Reply to Office Action of April 29, 2009

Docket No.: P17140/1020.P17140
Examiner: Adnan Baig
TC/A.U. 2416

Conclusion

It is believed that claims 1-5, 7 and 9-17 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited.

Applicants do not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the limitations of the independent claims and dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants hereby reserve the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the independent or dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to the Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,
KACVINSKY LLC

/Andrew H. Aurand/

Andrew H. Aurand, Reg. No. 61,875
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: July 29, 2009

KACVINSKY LLC
C/O CPA Global
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(724) 933-5529